

MINUTES

The Spartanburg Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review

Thursday, October 10, 2013 ~ 5:30 PM

City Hall Council Chambers

Board Members Attendance: David Stokes, Dr. Phillip Stone, II., Michael Chewning, Lewis Settle, Jessie Ruth Littlejohn, and Thomas Belenchia.

Absent Board Members: Donnie Love, Carolyn Schoepf-Harrison, and George Fain.

City Staff: Joshua Henderson, Planning Coordinator, Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant, and Martin Meek, Preservation Consultant.

Mr. Stokes, Acting Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M. and stated the hearing procedures. Mr. Stokes recognized the six board members present constituted a quorum, and he proceeded with the guidelines for the procedure of the meeting.

Dr. Stone moved approval of the Agenda for the October 10, 2013 meeting, and was seconded by Mrs. Littlejohn. The motion was unanimously approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Disposition of the minutes from the August 27, 2013 Special Call Meeting of the Board of Architectural Design and Historic Review.

Dr. Stone moved to approve the minutes from the August 27, 2013 Special Call Meeting, and was seconded by Mr. Settle. The motion was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.

Old Business

There was no old business for discussion.

New Business

Certificate of Appropriateness for Major Work – Consider the replacement of all existing 4-over-1 original wood windows with new 4-over-1 wood, double-hung windows. Also to consider the replacement of the non-original front door with a new front door @ 611 South Irwin Avenue in Hampton Heights. – Richard Hauptman, Owner.

Mr. Henderson came forward and was sworn, and submitted the report the Board Members had previously received, as well as the slides and presentation into evidence as Exhibit A. He informed the Board Members the request was to consider the replacement of all of the existing 4-over-1 original, single-hung wood windows, with new 4-over-1 wood, double-hung windows; and also to consider the replacement of the non-original front door with a new front door.

Mr. Richard Hauptman, Owner came forward and was sworn. He informed the Board Members he was originally from Connecticut; and had moved to South Carolina and spent about four months looking at older homes within the state, and had liked the Hampton Heights area and purchased the Bungalow Style home at 611 South Irwin Avenue. He further informed the Board Members the house was in very bad shape when he purchased it; and he explained in detail that he was basically restoring the entire house, and had been working constantly on the house since January, 2013. He loved the older homes, and believed in trying to keep what was original if at all possible. The issue had come up about the windows; and he explained that he liked the design of the windows and thought he would try and restore them. He brought a window that was typical to all of the windows on the house and presented it to the Board Members. He spent approximately a whole day to strip the six layers of paint off of one of the windows, and after the paint was stripped off, he explained to the Board Members the rails were deteriorated; and the wood on the windows was just too old and too frail, and would have to be replaced. The windows were also not energy efficient. Mr. Hauptman said he searched throughout the area for appropriate replacement windows, and explained the different types as follows: 1) a vinyl replacement with same design; 2) a wood window with same design, split on the inside and outside, with muntin bars on the outside, however; the muntin bars were paintable vinyl; and 3) he went to Neely's in town and found another window which he also brought for the Board to see, that was not the same design, but was typical of what was on the house, and had grills on the inside and outside, all wood, and were double-hung, as well as energy efficient windows. Mr. Hauptman explained it was very necessary to replace the windows and felt like the proposed window from Neely's was the best solution, as well as the best investment for him. He said all of his neighbors had been very supportive of him restoring the home; and that they all loved what he had done to the house so far. He explained the proposed new door was a much better fit for the house than the non-original front door that was currently on the house. Mr. Hauptman concluded his presentation by saying he wanted to be

allowed to do something that was architecturally correct for that period of house; and he asked for the Board's consideration.

Board Questions:

- Mrs. Littlejohn asked Mr. Hauptman about the difference in cost between repairing the original windows and the proposed new windows. Mr. Hauptman explained the proposed windows were not comparable to the original windows. He explained all of the rails on the original windows were all loose; and that having a window made was an option, but it was just not feasible for him just to have single pane glass.
- Mr. Stokes informed Mr. Hauptman that the Board Members were here to decide whether or not his application fit in with the Guidelines. He thanked him for all the work he was doing to the property.
- Mr. Stokes asked Mr. Henderson why the meeting packets they previously received had stated the windows were not deteriorated beyond repair. Mr. Henderson said he would turn that over to Mr. Meek, the City of Spartanburg's Preservation Consultant.
- Mr. Meek came forward and was sworn; and he informed the Board Members he and Mr. Henderson visited the property to look at the condition of the sashes. The wood was not deteriorated, and the muntin bars were in-tact. The problem was, as the applicant had pointed out, when you grab the top of the sash and try to push it up, the top rail dislocates from the side rails and the head of the muntin bars; which he explained created a dangerous condition. He said in terms of the wooden material, it was not deteriorated. There were a lot of problems with removal of all the paint as the applicant had explained.
- Dr. Stone asked Mr. Meek if the windows were operable. Mr. Meek said the real problem was that windows of this age had been painted shut for some years, and as the applicant pointed out there were at least five or six layers of paint on the windows.
- Mr. Stokes asked if the weights were in-tact. Mr. Hauptman said the weights were o.k.
- Mrs. Littlejohn asked Mr. Meek about the cost for the petitioner to get the windows repaired, as opposed to having new ones installed. Mr. Meek explained it would probably take a few days per window regarding the time it took to strip the paint, clean the windows, and that the petitioners would still end up with the single strip glass, and the applicant would probably spend a couple of hundred dollars trying to get the top rail.
- Mr. Meek asked Staff about the cost of the replacement window. Mr. Henderson said it would be approximately \$177.97 per sash replacement, and there were eight sash replacements.
- Mr. Meek estimated the petitioner would spend between six to eight hundred dollars per window, trying to repair the windows.
- Mrs. Littlejohn asked if the petitioner repaired the original windows, would there still be a safety issue. Mr. Meek said yes.

Mr. Henderson came forward again and said he would finish his presentation at this time. He said his report mentioned there were eleven windows, and ten would be replaced. He explained what was going on with the window at the far back of the house regarding a double window that was not original to the house and did not match any of the single windows. Two of the windows would be full window frame replacements and eight would only be sash replacements, for a total of approximately \$1,423.76. Slides were shown of the property; original windows, the house, and surrounding area in order to better illustrate the request. He also showed a slide of the proposed door and said it was more appropriate for the house than what was currently on the house. Mr. Henderson concluded his presentation by saying Staff is of the opinion that the existing windows had been shielded from the weather for some time and therefore are not deteriorated beyond repair. By completing some routine maintenance, the windows could be operable and not lose their historical significance. Also the current front door was not original to the structure and the proposed front door, which was not matching to an original style door with regards to material, is consistent in design. Therefore, Staff is of the opinion there is no basis for approving the application to remove the original windows since they are not deteriorated beyond repair; and there is no basis for denial of the application of the proposed front door since it will be replacing a non-original door and is consistent in design with regards to the style of architecture.

Board Questions:

- Mr. Stokes asked Mr. Henderson if this was just one Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Henderson said that was correct.
- Mr. Stokes asked about if the Board should only approve one of the items on the Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Henderson explained if there was a split in the approval, the windows would be listed as Item A, and the door would be Item B.
- Mr. Stokes said any said motion would need to take that into consideration.

Mr. Stokes opened the public hearing and asked anyone who wished to speak in favor of the request to come forward.

- Mr. Daryl Griggs of 598 South Irwin Avenue came forward and was sworn. He informed the Board Members he lived across the street from the petitioner, and was very much in favor of the request. Mr. Griggs also brought up the fact that there were several abandoned properties in the area that were owned by the City of Spartanburg that were eyesores. He was surprised the abandoned homes were allowed to sit there; and he would much rather live near someone such as the applicant who was really trying to restore his home and improve the neighborhood.

Mr. Stokes said the Board Members were aware of the abandoned properties, and had been trying to work with City Staff for some time in order to have something done about the properties.

- Mr. Scott Clausen of 608 South Irwin Avenue came forward and was sworn; and said he found this an odd place to be regarding where they were at with the proposed case, regarding the safety issues with the windows. He said he liked what he saw in the replacement window, and felt it would be an aesthetic improvement to the neighborhood that would seem to correct several of the deficiencies the original windows had.
- Ms. Tonya Daves of 642 South Irwin Avenue came forward and was sworn, and said she was in total support of the request. She informed the Board Members before Mr. Hauptman had purchased the house, she had previously looked at the house, and found it completely uninhabitable; and she refused to purchase the house and had bought one down the street. Ms. Daves explained in detail that she was all in favor of following historic guidelines; and she would like to see the request approved. She also reiterated the fact that there were dilapidated houses that were accidents waiting to happen and complete eyesores in the neighborhood; and she had witnessed people going in and out of the structures at night. Ms. Daves felt there were also significant safety issues involved and explained of the different crimes in said area; and people may hold the Board Members responsible if something was not done about them.

Mr. Stokes explained to Ms. Daves that although the City of Spartanburg may own the abandoned homes, the Board of Architecture and Historic Review was completely a volunteer Board, and were not employed by the City of Spartanburg. He said the Board Members felt her concerns and appreciated her relaying these problems for the record. He suggested she call Mitch Kennedy, Community Services Director for the City of Spartanburg to relay her concerns; and he also suggested she call the Law Enforcement people when she witnesses problems with crimes or people going in and out of the homes.

Mr. Stokes asked anyone else who wished to speak in favor of the request, or if there was anyone who wished to speak against the request to come forward. No one else came forward. Mr. Stokes closed the public hearing.

Dr. Stone said in order to go ahead and get a motion on the floor, he moved to approve the petitioner's request as presented regarding the windows and the door; and he was seconded by Mr. Settle.

Discussion of Motion:

- Mr. Chewing informed the petitioner he appreciated everything he was doing, but the Board Members were bound by the Guidelines.
- Dr. Stone said he respected that fact, and he had never before voted to approve a window request such as was proposed. He agreed the guidelines were in place for a reason, but felt even if the windows were restored there would still be safety issues; and he said he felt the petitioner's complete proposal should be approved.

- Mrs. Littlejohn agreed with Dr. Stone.
- Mr. Settle also felt the request should be approved; and could not wait to see the house when the petitioner was finished.
- Mr. Stokes felt everyone appreciated all the work the petitioner was doing to the home, but he felt it came down to whether or not the guidelines were followed. He said the motion on the table did not follow the guidelines.
- Mr. Belenchia said he had always felt and advocated that it was up to the Board Members to interpret the guidelines and make modifications when needed; and he was in support of the petitioner.

The motion to approve the request was approved by a vote of 4 to 2, with Mr. Stokes and Mr. Chewning in opposition.

Mr. Henderson informed the petitioner he would receive an approval letter from the City, and then he would need to pull a permit from the Building Inspection Department, in order to be able to do the windows and door replacement.

Mr. Hauptman thanked the Board Members, and his neighbors for their testimony. He said people should be encouraged to move in to historic districts, and felt he may be able to receive tax credits for the replacement of the windows. He also felt this fact could be used as an incentive in order to get people to purchase in the Hampton Heights area regarding tax credits.

Mr. Stokes informed the petitioner in order to qualify for those tax credits, a person would need to adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation; and that removing those windows would not allow him to apply for the tax credits. He further informed the petitioner that he could apply for energy tax credits; and explained once you removed a significant portion of the historic character of the home, you would no longer be qualified to be put on the National Register.

Update on Approved Certificate of Appropriateness for Minor Works since the August 27, 2013 meeting – Joshua Henderson.

Mr. Henderson went over the Staff approved Minor Works since the August 27, 2013 meeting.

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mr. Henderson reminded the Board Members that the 2013 Fall SCAPA Conference would be held at the Spartanburg Marriott October 17 – 18, 2013; and the City would pay for any Board Member's registration; and if anyone else wished to attend, please contact Mrs. Roland

Mrs. Littlejohn said she was happy with the Board's decision on tonight's case, and felt it was the right thing to do.

Mr. Stokes said he appreciated the excellent job that Staff was doing.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.



 David Stokes, Acting Chair

Dannie Love, Chair 

Minutes by Julie Roland, Administrative Assistant